Previous references. (1923) **File No. 2**

(Inwd) **Serial Nos.**

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 2

Part B for March 1924

SUBJECT

Appeals against the order of the Mysore Deputy Commissioner re the ~~Archakship~~ of the Sri Lakshmi-narasimhaswamy & Sri Anjaneyaswamy temples at Akkihebbal, Krishnarajpet Taluq.

No. 1261 dated 14.3.1924 — To the Petitioner & copy to Mysore Commissioner

The order of the Deputy Com^r is correct & does not call for interference

Muz 1] 1923

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

(Muz)

NOTES

File No 219/1923

FILE HEADING

Archakship of Sri Lakshmi Narasimha Swami and Sri Anjaneya Swami temples at Akkihebbal, Krishnarajpet Taluk.

From Rama Swami Bhatta,

No Petition Dated Received 18 2 1924

Diary No.	Enclos	Spare Copies.	Serial No
1006			1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Appeals against the Mysore Dy. Comrs. order re the Archakship of the said temples.

NOTES AND ORDERS

1) Petition is duly stamped & copy of the Dy. Comrs. order appealed against is produced.

2) The Dy. Comrs order is dy 3-11-23 while the appeal petition was received in the Muz. Comrs Office on 4.2.1924.

NOTES--First Sheet

WD 0560—GPB—500—9 9 22

G. R. S. III-2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 21[illegible] of 19[illegible]

Serial No.
By, under Standing orders, the appeal in such cases lies to Govt, the Mag. Cent desired the apll to present his appeal to this office. (memo no. 475 dt 9.2.1924) and he has done so. 3) The appeal seems to be in time 4) May a report with records be called for from the Mag. Cent ? Submits. for orders. 27/2/1924 5) A report with Cent Records may be called for. 27.2.24 6) Deduct the time taken for the preparation of Copy viz from 28.11.23 to 4.12.23, the appeal was within time when it was presented to the Magn Cent. 7) 2) But the order of the Deputy Cent seems the correct & Calling no reference 1.9.24 2nd member) 8) In reply Appellant may be given an Endt accordingly 6/3/24

NOTE—Contn. sheet

35
4.3.24

G. R. S. III-21

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 215 of 1923

Serial No.	
	1) Dft. cutd. Fulness M 24 7/3/24 7/3/24 10) Issue 9 3 24
2	To the petitioner Archak Ramaswamy Bhatta. No. 1261 d. 16. 3. 24. Informs him that the order of the D. C. appealed against is correct & does not call for interference To the Mirasi Commr. No. 1262 d. 16. 3. 24. Forwards copy of the above with compliments

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Appeal Pet.
C 18 of 23-24
4-2-24



Pet.n Box 4/7/24
Postage – Stamp
(with Copy & Notice
Dr.

Mang.

Mang. 219-23-

Before the ~~Revenue Commissioner~~ Respondent
(Mangalore)

Pet.n filed on 19-4-24

Dis. Appeal 180 of 1923-24

Ramaswamy Bhatta, Appellant—

~~Vs~~

Narasimha Bhatta Respondent—

The appellant begs to appeal from the order of the Deputy Commissioner in Dis. A 180 of 1923-24 on the grounds:—

1 That owing to combination of a few disinterested partisans of the Respondent the Learned Deputy Commissioner has not been properly represented the correct facts connected with the land in dispute between the parties;

2 That even on the facts as set forth in the finding

Appeal Peh
C 18 of 23-24
4-2-211



Petn Box 4/2/24
Rotwo – Stamp
(writ Copy Kheira
2/1

Mysz.219-23-1.

Before the ~~Revenue Commissioner~~ Dep. Commr
B

Mysore

Dis Appeal 180 of 1923-24

Ramaswamy Bhatta, Appellant—

~~Vs~~

Narasimha Bhatta Respondent—

The appellant begs to appeal from the order of the Depy Commr Mysore in Dis A 180/23-24 on the grounds:—

That owing to combination of a few mischievous partisans of the Respondent the learned Depd. Commissioner has not been properly represented the case & facts connected with the trade in dispute between the parties;

2 That even on the facts as set forth in the pro- ...

Petn Bx. on 19/2/24
Returned by Govt 1912

Appeal Petn
C 18 of 23-24
4-2



4 4
Mang
Petn Box 4/7/24
Postwo – Stamp
(with copy & Vakil
2/

Mang. 219-23-1.

Before the ~~Revenue Commissioner~~ Respondent
(Mangalore)

This Appeal is 1923. 4

Ramaswamy Shetty, Appellant

~~Vs~~

Narasimha Bhatta Respondent

Petn BA
1912

Decree
1911

The appellant begs to appeal from the order of the Deputy Commissioner of Mangalore in Misc A No 1/1-21-21 on the grounds:-

That owing to combination of a few mischievous persons of the Respondent the Learned Deputy Commissioner has not been properly represented by the Pleader and the Pleader was not in a position to place before the Court the true facts of the case;

2 That the ...

as it forth

of the Order, now under appeal
to the Appellant, as agreed to
be true by the parties before the
Local Authorities, is entitled
to the Archak right, by turns,
at least;

3 That the order of the Deputy
Commissioner in holding that the
Appellant alone is responsible
for any claim is ill-founded;

4 That in the circumstance
of the Case, the order of the Deputy
Commissioner is unjust and erroneous

The Appellant prays
that the Honourable Court may
be pleased to set aside the
order of the Deputy Commissioner
in question and direct the
duty of the Archak Claimed
may be performed by the brothers
(Appellant and Respondent) by turns.

[illegible]

Recommended with the endorsement
of the Government Advocate as
the appeal was limited this
is matter which requires
being Considered.

[illegible]
18/11/07



In the Court of the Deputy [illegible]
[illegible]

present [illegible]

Deputy [illegible]

Dated -- this 2nd day of January 2

Miscellaneous Appeal [illegible]
20-2

Appellant [illegible]

Ramaswamy Bhallar - [illegible]

(both Sons of [illegible]
residing in [illegible]
Krishnagiri & 3 others)

--- vs ---

Facts of the case.

This is a case [illegible]
[illegible] between the
the Respondent [illegible]
in the [illegible]

RESIDENTS OFFICE
KRISHNAGIRI DISTRICT.

at Akkihebbal, [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[

to the ... the ... Annes
the Said ... ple ... the ... l. el
of their father and ... b: ... t
the younger brother R. ... a ...
- bhatta (Appellt) ... pe l ... f ...
owing to some ... al te
with his elder brother.

While effect was being
to the above order of the ... b ...
officer dated 16 11-20, R ... a
- bhatta (probably with the i le
evading the handing over
Temple charge to his elder brother
Narasimha bhatta) is reported
have absented himself from
Village without ... 1 ...
17th December 1920, entrusting
Temple charge to one Ramachan
of Hole-Narasipur. This ...
bhatta attended to ... l
duties till the 21st ...
and went away to ...
place leaving the temple
with a boy of 9 or 10 ye ...
were not being ... ed ...
in the Temple ...

REGISTERER'S OFFICE
MYSORE
DISTRICT.

[illegible] about two months
[illegible] allegations.
[illegible] Rs. [illegible] of
[illegible] Land [illegible]
[illegible] Security [illegible]
[illegible] appellant [illegible] the
[illegible] Sub Division
Officer on 16.11.20, and [illegible]
in order to stay the execution of
the Sub Division Officer's order pending
disposal of the appeal.

It so occurred, that Mr. Nima
Bhutia, who passed order on 16.11.20
as the Sub Division Officer happened
to be in charge of the duties of the Deputy
Commissioner, when the appeal petition
was presented; and so, in view of the
fact that the appeal was against
his own orders and at the urgent
representation of the petitioner,
he on 6-1-21 ordered the Stay of the
execution of his previous order
in the case. That the appeal would
be finally disposed of by the Deputy
Commissioner (Permanent).
After giving effect to this office
order of 6-1-21, a detailed report-
The facts of the case was submitted

[illegible] who stated on 11-2-21 that [illegible] was indifferent to work in [illegible] and not anxious to help [illegible] etc, and requested that the [illegible] passed by him (on 16 11 0) be upheld.

On 11.2.1921 the [illegible] of the above Temple [illegible] of Akkihebbal presented, [illegible] before this office [illegible] represented that the present Archaka Ramana-bhatta was not well versed in Shastras, that he was not religious that his continuance as Archaka was a matter of great concern among the general public and that the Rathotsavam in the Temple was to come off [illegible] and that the jatra will not be satisfactorily conducted for the above reasons if removed from this post etc. etc. 21

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
MYSORE
DISTRICT.

-g forwarded to the sub division
-r with instruction to see that
-ll the [illegible] was carried out
was to say [illegible], he submitted
a report to this office on 15.2.1921
regarding the circumstances of
the case and requesting that the stay
order passed by him (on 6.2.21)
may be cancelled so far as it charge of the District be cancelled
and that Ramaswamy Bhatta (appellt)
be ordered to hand over charge of
the Taluk duties, records, and other
papers to his elder brother Narasimh
Bhatta pending disposal of appeal.

On this the Deputy Commissioner
passed the following order on 16-2-192

"The Stay order is cancelled.
But the property must be handed
over to Narasimha Bhatta."

The order was in due course
communicated to the Taluk authorities
While this order was being given
effect to, the whole village which
was first in favour of Narasimha-
bhatta, divided into two factions,
one siding the appellant and the
other the respondent. The result
it was, that the Deputy Commissioner's

order was not a decision till 5-3-1921 when it is stated that the Mysore Umbrella, the Golden Flower of the Temple, after being presented to his elder brother was withdrawn. Still, some temple jewels are yet delivered to the Amildar as reported. In the meantime - probably through the Amildar, both the Villagers, both the respondent have filed, counter Statement - before the Commissioner on 5-3-1921 to the effect that they are agreeable to look after the Temple duties - both by turn of rotation of one year each and to divide the income equally between themselves.

COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE
MYSORE DISTRICT.

Subsequently on 11-3-1921 Respondent Narasimha Rao submitted a report to the Amildar purporting that Ramaswamy Bhatta is not yet to join

the Temple jewels and entrusting them to the charge of his brother Narasimha bhatta. (Opt.) to [illegible] or [illegible] which was opposed by [illegible] and prayed that under the circumstances explained in the report the statement filed by them before the Collector on 5.1.1901 be cancelled etc.

The Amildar thereon ordered the delivering of all Temple jewels to Narasimha bhatta, which was done. The Amildar is in favour of giving the Temple charge to both the brothers by turns, as agreed to by them formerly.

order.

There can possibly be no hesitation in dismissing the appeal of Ramaswami bhatta. The local officers did not act strongly in the matter of getting the charge handed over to the Respt. Narasimha bhatta. Now, the only

only co[illegible]
as the latter is concerned is to
contend that ... appellant to ... He should ... later, he prayed for ... agreement. The local offices have not been of one mind, for which is not ...

In any case, as ... at the outset, there ... hesitation in ... has no case. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Sd. B.K. ...
Deputy ...

Dated 3-11-23.

"Copy"

By Order

Superintendent

Compared by

Copy applied on 28-11-23
Copy ready on 4-12-23
Copy delivered on ...
Nos. of words 1114
Copying fee 1-8-0
Comparing fee 0-6-0
Total 1-14-0



ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

Before the Revenue Commissioner in Mysore

192 — ನೇ ನೆಂಬರು.

Mrs A ಫಿ 23-24—

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜೀದಾರ್. ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪ್ಪೋನೆಂಟ್.

..... V.S. .....

ಮಾ॥ ರಾ॥ ..... ಗೆ.

..... ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮ.

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ವರವಾಗಿ ಅಖೈರುವರಿವಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಿವಾದ ಜರುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ವರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ, ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ, ಜಾರಿಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಸಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಸಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ನಹ ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ, ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾಪನು ಪಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ನಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ನಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮ ಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಆಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲನಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ಧನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ.

ತಾರೀಖು 2-2-24— ರುಜು .....

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ತರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷನು ರುಜುಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತ್ಯಾರುನಾಮಾ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

ಸಿಕ್ಕುವಸ್ಥಳ:— ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪೇಟೆ ವಿದ್ಯಾನಾಗರ ಬುಕ್ಕಡಿಪೋ, ಬಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೈಯ್ಯಂಗಾರ್ರವರಲ್ಲಿ ಡೊರಿಯುತ್ತೆ.

OFFICE OF THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE.

No. R2 Dis 475 of 23-7 Dated, Bangalore, 9th Dec. 1924.

Petition Register

Endorsement granted to Archak Doddasamy Bhatta,

Petition Register No. Appl.U.1P/23-24	2nd son of Alasingabhatta late
Dated 1-2-1924	Archak of Sri Lakshmiramana and
Subject:—	Sri Anjaneyaswamy temples at
Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner Mysore District in re the Archakship of the temples at Akkihebbal.	Akkihebbal, Krishnarajpet Taluk
	in reply
	to his Petition Register No. as per margin.

The Petitioner is informed that as his claim relates to Pujari Hak appeals in respect of which against the Deputy Commissioner's order lie only to Government under the Muzrai Regulation, he should present his appeal petition to Government. The petition is herewith returned.

For Revenue Commissioner.
Muzrai

Muz 4]

SUBJECT ....

.. ..

... .

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Section Muz.

File No. 219-23.

Serial No. 2.

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the *192*

No. 1261

Date of issue 14. 3. 26

To

Signed by Sri T. Ramaraya

-Endorsement granted to Archak Ramaswamy Bhatta with ref. to his petition regd. no. 1004 dy 18-2-1926, appealing against the order of the Dy. Comr. Mysore Dist. regarding the Archak Shi, Ra

Sri Anjaneya Swami
temples at Akkihebbal in
the Krishnarajpet Taluk.

The petr is informed
that the order of the Dy.
Commr appealed against
is correct and does not
call for interference.

By order
Sd/- 9.3.24.
Dy Regr. Secretary
9/3/24

Copy to the Petr. 1262 & 14.3.24
Commr

List of enclosures

By order
Sd/- 9.3.24
Dy Regr. Secretary
9.3.24

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563—GPB—2 500—27 7 22